

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C., 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,315	03/29/2001	Motoharu Akiyama	OPS Case 527	2264
7	590 02/14/2003			
FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL & TANIS, P.C. 2026 Rambling Road Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1699			EXAMINER	
			HOWARD, JACQUELINE V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1764	0
			DATE MAILED: 02/14/2003	0

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		53
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/821,315	AKIYAMA, MOTOHARU
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jacqueline V. Howard	1764
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a largely within the statutory minimum of thir riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	13 November 2002 .	
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) □	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und		
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the applica		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) <u>1-8 and 10</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) <u>9</u> is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	nd/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		
Applicant may not request that any objection to		
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on If approved, corrected drawings are required in		alsapproved by the Examiner.
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	• •	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	, Examinor.	
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 H S C	8 119(a)-(d) or (f)
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	eigh phonty under 35 0.0.0.	3 113(2) (0) 51 (1).
	nonte have been received	
1. Certified copies of the priority docum2. Certified copies of the priority docum		Application No.
Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International See the attached detailed Office action for a	priority documents have beer I Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n received in this National Stage
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	estic priority under 35 U.S.C.	. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dom		

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)

Attachment(s)

6) Other:

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/821,315

Art Unit: 1764

Claims 1 to 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki et al (5,958,850) or Pillon et al (5,227,082) for the reasons of record as fully set forth in the Office Action dated July 2, 2002.

Applicant's arguments filed November 13, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant alleges patentability over Matsuzaki on the basis that it has no specific disclosure of a poly α -olefin being contained therein or a synthetic hydrocarbon oil having the claimed kinematic viscosity. This argument is not well taken, the disclosure at col. 2 lines 65 to 67 and col. 3 lines 54 to 58 certainly suggest a synthetic hydrocarbon oil having the claimed kinematic viscosity as well as poly α -olefins. The examiner notes that only one of the five rejected claims recite poly α -olefin as the synthetic oil.

Applicant alleges patentability over Pillon et al on the basis that there is no disclosure in this reference regarding the composition being applied to a molded plastic product and the effects associated therewith. It is the examiner's position that the rejected claims are drawn to a composition not a method of use. Patents are not granted for old composition based on their intended use.

Claims 6 to 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 6,0031598.

The Japanese reference teaches a grease composition for lubricating plastic ball seats comprising a synthetic poly-alpha olefin oil having a kinamatic viscosity of $500 \text{ mm}^2/\text{s}$ at 40°C , a urea thickener and an amide wax rust inhibitor.

Application/Control Number: 09/821,315

Art Unit: 1764

Applicant amended the claims to recite the lubricant composition was an oil composition and alleges patentability over the Japanese reference on the basis that the reference teaches a grease which does not have the same effect on plastics a oils. The examiner takes the position that the skilled lubricant chemist recognizes a grease is an oil composition that has been thickened with a thickening agent. The omission of a substance with the concomitant loss of its function is not unobvious. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to omit the urea thickener from the synthetic oil, rust inhibitor composition when its function was not desired. The claimed invention would not be patentable over the Japanese reference absent a showing of unexpected results flowing from such omission. (In re Wilson 153 USPQ 740).

Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Application/Control Number: 09/821,315 Page 4

Art Unit: 1764

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to J. V. Howard at telephone number (703) 308-2514.

J. V. Howard/mn February 6, 2003 Albwar 6